



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,129	03/31/2004	Kevin Loughran	9-3-2	9164

7590 07/24/2007
Lucent Technologies Inc.
Docket Administrator - Room 3J-219
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

EXAMINER

CHU, WUTCHUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/815,129	LOUGHRAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Wutchung Chu	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/19/2005.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15-17, 19-20, and 23-26 is rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wybenga et al. (US2004/0223504).

Regarding claims 1, Wybenga et al. disclose Apparatus and method for workflow-based routing in a distributed architecture router (**see paragraph 9 line 1-4**) comprising:

- at least one node interconnected through a fabric, the at least one node (**see paragraph 35 line 6 routing nodes**) comprising :
 - at least one of a plurality of network processing devices (**see figure 2 box 230 classification processor box 240 system processor box 250 async variables controller**) for receiving at least one of the cell and the packet information, for determining a destination within the node for the cell and the packet information, and for at least one of routing and forwarding the cell and the packet information to the destination (**see paragraph 21 line 5-15**);

- a shared bus structure for coupling each of the network processing devices with each other (**see paragraph 40 line 3 PCI bus and figure 2 ref 290**); and
- an interface for coupling at least one of the network processing devices with the fabric (**see paragraph 35 line 8 switch fabrics and figure 1 box 155**) to support communication between nodes (**see paragraph 42 line 7**).

Regarding claim 2, Wybenga et al. teaches the destination is determined in response to at least one of stored routing rules and characteristics of the cell and the packet information (**see paragraph 39 line 14 classification processor**).

Regarding claim 3, Wybenga et al. teaches the at least one of a plurality of network processing devices employ dynamically updated routing rules (**see paragraph 36 line 5-8**).

Regarding claim 4, Wybenga et al. teaches the at least one of a plurality of network processing devices performs the at least one of routing and forwarding on both the cell and the packet information simultaneously (**see paragraph 46**).

Regarding claim 5, Wybenga et al. teaches the at least one of a plurality of network processing devices directly delivers the at least one of routing and forwarding the cell and the packet information into a memory of the destination (**see paragraph 36 line 5-10**).

Regarding claim 7, Wybenga et al. teaches the interface provides the cell and the packet information to the at least one network processing device (**see paragraph 36 line 6-7**).

Regarding claim 8, Wybenga et al. teaches the interface comprises at least one of a System Interface (**see figure 142 PMD module**) and a Maintenance Interface (**see paragraph 41 line 8 doorbell register interface**).

Regarding claim 11, Wybenga et al. teaches the node further comprises:

- a general-purpose processor (**see paragraph 41 line 6 –16 and figure 2 box 240 system processor**) for at least one of controlling the at least two network processing devices and performing maintenance on the node (**see paragraph 42**).

Regarding claim 12, Wybenga et al. teaches the shared bus structure couples the general-purpose processor with each of the network processing devices (**see figure 2 ref 290**).

Regarding claim 13, Wybenga et al. teaches the shared bus structure comprises a Peripheral Component Interconnect bus (**see figure 2 ref 290 PCI bus and paragraph 40 line 3**).

Regarding claim 15, Wybenga et al. teaches comprising: at least one external system input/output interface (**see figure 1 box 146 IOP**).

Regarding claim 16, Wybenga et al. teaches the external system input/output interface supports at least one transport mechanism type, the at least one transport mechanism type comprising at least one of Asynchronous Transfer Mode, Internet Protocol, and Frame Relay (see paragraph 36 line 13-14).

Regarding claim 17, Wybenga et al. teaches a communication node for processing at least one of cell and packet information comprising:

- at least one of a plurality of network processing devices for receiving at least one of the cell and the packet information (see figure 2 box 230 classification processor box 240 system processor box 250 async variables controller), for determining a destination within the node for the cell and the packet information, and for at least one of routing and forwarding the cell and the packet information to the destination (see paragraph 21 line 5-15), the destination determined in response to at least one of stored routing rules and characteristics of the cell and the packet information (see paragraph 39 line 14 classification processor);
- a shared bus structure for coupling each of the network processing devices with each other (see paragraph 40 line 3 PCI bus and figure 2 ref 290); and
- at least one of a System Interface (see figure 142 PMD module) and a Maintenance Interface (see paragraph 41 line 8 doorbell register interface) for coupling for providing the cell and the packet information to

the at least one network processing device (see paragraph 35 line 8
switch fabrics and figure 1 box 155).

Regarding claims 19-20 and 23-26, Wybenga et al. disclose all the limitations as discussed in the rejection of claims 3-5, and 11-13, and 15 and are therefore claims 18-21 and 23-26 are rejected using the same rationales.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wybenga et al. in view of Sundling et al. (US6785277).

Regarding claims 3 and 18, Wybenga et al. disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the at least one of a plurality of network processing devices employ dynamically updated routing rules.

Sundling et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the use of cost factors change, all or some of the respective routing tables must be modified to properly utilize this information (**see Sundling et al. column 9 line 65 to column 10 line 10**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the cost factors change as taught by Sundling et al. in apparatus and method for workflow-based routing in a distributed architecture router of Wybenga et al. in order to provide update routing transmission services.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6,14, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wybenga et al. in view of its background.

Regarding claim 6,14, 21, Wybenga et al. disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the at least one network processing device supports peer-to-peer routing.

Wybenga et al. background from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the use of new services, such as voice-over-IP (VoIP) or streaming applications, and the development of mobile Internet (**see Wybenga et al. background paragraph 2**) which are forms of peer-to-peer system. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the new services, such as

voice-over-IP (VoIP) or streaming applications, and the development of mobile Internet as taught by the background of Wybenga et al. in apparatus and method for workflow-based routing in a distributed architecture router of Wybenga et al. in order to provide peer-to-peer system service and system transmission method.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9,10, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wybenga et al. in view of Oner (US2005/0078696).

Regarding claims 9, 10, and 22, Wybenga et al. teaches the interface comprises at least one of a System Interface (**see figure 142 PMD module**) and a Maintenance Interface (**see paragraph 41 line 8 doorbell register interface**), and disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the interface comprises a multiplexer for creating a multiplexed stream from the at least one of the cell and the packet information.

Oner from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the use of address multiplexer (**see Oner paragraph 125 line 9 and figure 9 box 92 address multiplexer**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the address multiplexer as taught by Oner in apparatus and

method for workflow-based routing in a distributed architecture router of Wybenga et al. in order to enhance the efficiency of the system.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ricciulli (US2004/0202190) discloses layer-1 packet filtering.

Gulati et al. (US2004/0151170) disclose management of received data within host device using linked lists.

Freeman (US2003/0035375) discloses method and apparatus for routing of messages in a cycle-based system.

Dai et al. (US2004/0246961) disclose method and apparatus for transmitting wake-up packets over a network data processing system.

Block et al. (US2005/0025122) disclose method and system for filtering inter-node communication in a data processing system.

Lu et al. (US6839345) disclose MAC/PHY interface.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wutchung Chu whose telephone number is 571 270 1411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 1000 - 1500EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on 571 272 7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WMC/
Wutchung Chu

Robert H. Wilson

EDAN ORGAD
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Edan Orgad 1/8/07